

Your name: Deana Christ (Michelle Yvonne Wood)

Address: 729 Jones St. #302

S.F., CA 94109

Phone Number: (415) 335-0101

Fax Number: _____

E-mail Address: _____

Pro Se [Select one: Plaintiff or Defendant]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

[Select one location: San Francisco / Oakland / San Jose / Eureka]

FILED

OCT 13 2021

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LB

CV 21 - 8012

Deana Christ

(Michelle Yvonne Wood)

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

Dulge Thener Hixon

Dulge Vince Chhabria

Defendant(s).

Case Number: _____

Title of Document:

Obstruction of Justice

and discrimination

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Obstruction of Justice
and discrimination CASE NO.: _____

PAGE NO. ____ OF ____ [JDC TEMPLATE]

Dear Honorable Judge of District Court,

On September 15, 2020, I filed a lawsuit against Donald Trump for violation of the U.S. constitution and endangerment of the American people. He did so by changing a law, the National Environmental Policy Act without the necessary power and authority to do so. His charge is on three counts (1) He violated Amendment 1 by restricting the people's freedom of speech (2) He violated Article 1 by denying Congress its power and authority to make and change laws (3) He betrayed the intentions of the constitution's preamble by which strive to provide the general welfare of the country. He endangered the country by ensuring that global warming would not be covered by the NEPA.

Judge Thomas Nixon recommended to Judge Vinson Chhabria that he dismiss the case, and Judge Chhabria did as he asked him to do. However, by dismissing the case, both judges committed obstruction of justice and discrimination. They denied me my first amendment right to prosecute in court with claims that were false and discriminated against me for simply being poor (I am disabled with kidney failure - I do dialysis), saying that people who apply for in forma pauperis notice baseless claims that should be dismissed.

Not only was I treated unfairly by the judges, they also obstructed justice by claiming the case, because all dismissed are unconstitutional no matter the reasons why they are made. I will explain

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Obstruction of Justice in CASE NO.: _____

1 D. Smissel's fellow judges the opportunity to deliver
 2 non-guilty verdict, to criminal & civil suit defendants,
 3 without the consent of the jury or that of a judge who
 4 hears the case. The prosecutor has no chance to prove
 5 the guilt of the defendant, which is his or her right.
 6 The victim has no chance to achieve justice for his
 7 or her suffering. Crime and other wrong-doing goes
 8 unpunished, and since punishment is designed to prevent
 9 more crime from being committed, more crime is
 10 now committed because there is no deterrence.

11 Our wonderful judicial system is designed to pro-
 12 tect both the victim and the perpetrator of the
 13 crime, not just the perpetrator, as dismissals do. Dis-
 14 missals only help the defendant. They do nothing to
 15 make the system function better. In fact, they completely
 16 stop the natural process of the judicial system and
 17 put judges in a position of way too much power so
 18 that they can basically do anything they want and
 19 justify their actions by quoting precedents and decisions
 20 made by the Supreme Court, even decisions that are
 21 unconstitutional. Also, the obligatory adherence to
 22 precedents has no basis in constitutional law, only
 23 in legal doctrine. And if the Supreme Court makes
 24 a decision that contradicts the constitution, no judge
 25 can legitimately claim that his decision is warranted
 26 because the Supreme Court says it's ok.

27 In this case, the victim of obstruction of justice
 28 or discrimination is myself. I have been denied, by
 Obstruction of Justice and Discrimination

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Obstruction of Justice and Discrimination CASE NO.: _____

1 the judge's false claims, my right to seek justice for
 2 Donald Trump's crime against America, and my freedom
 3 to speak in court has been denied. Furthermore, my
 4 intention has been labeled "delusional" and "hase-
 5 less", when in truth my case is sound and can be
 6 proved in court if I am allowed to do so.

7 However, it is not my obligation to prove anything
 8 to the judge in my complaint. That is what the
 9 trial is for. My complaint needs only to
 10 state the allegations, not to prove them.

11 Please review my obligation that I made after
 12 the dismissal of my case. They explain the
 13 falsehood of the reason why the judge denied me
 14 the right to prosecute Mr. Trump for his
 15 crime of violation of the constitution and endangere-
 16 ment of the American people. Please understand
 17 that judges dismiss cases because they claim
 18 they cannot because there is a federal law
 19 further to be found anywhere, certainly, not in
 20 the U.S. constitution.

21 At last relief, I am requesting that I be
 22 allowed to prosecute Mr. Trump. I will regain
 23 the dignity that has been taken from me as a
 24 litigant, and my first amendment rights will have
 25 been preserved. In my trial against Mr.
 26 Trump I will need a jury (I asked for one
 27 originally, but it was not noted in the docket). I
 28 will also need to have Speaker Nancy Pelosi to

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: ^{Obstruct Justice} ~~and discrimination~~ CASE NO.:

1 subpoenaed to witness for my claim. Her address
 2 is 1236 Longworth A.O.B., Washington, DC.
 3 20515

4 Thank you for everything you do for this
 5 country. You are a beautiful, compassionate person
 6 and I trust you with all my heart

7
 8 God bless you.

9
 10 Sincerely

11 Jesus Christ

12 (Michelle Yvonne Wood)

13 * I want to add to line 8 of page 1 that Mr. Trump
 14 made certain that the people would be denied their
 15 right to have input into the decision making process
 16 of the EPA, as is the intent of the law.

17
 18 Date: 10/10/2021

Sign Name: Michelle Yvonne Wood

19 Print Name: Michelle Yvonne Wood

20 Jesus Christ

21 I will need a jury in this trial

22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28 Obstruction of Justice

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: al Discrimination CASE NO.: _____

PAGE NO. 4 OF _____ [JDC TEMPLATE]

Dear Honorable District Judge,

I am contesting Judge Hixson's dismissal of my claim that Donald John Trump violated the United States constitution and endangered the American people by changing a law, the National Environmental Policy Act. Judge Hixson's excuses for the dismissal are outrageous.

First, Judge Hixson claimed that I failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted. I am the plaintiff in this case because I am an American citizen. What Mr. Trump did to the entire country, he did to me as well. The relief I requested is for all Americans. I am asking for protection from Donald Trump's dangerous behavior. Monetary relief or compensation will not accomplish the ensurance of this protection. Am I wrong to have the well being of all Americans at heart when I ask that Mr. Trump be restricted from hurting them again? Absolutely not.

Then, Judge Hixson claimed that I did not specify the "crime" I accused Donald Trump of committing.

This is ridiculous. Clearly, when I say "crime", I am referring to Mr. Trump's violation of the United States constitution and endangerment of the American people. Judge Hixson continued to paraphrase my claim in a way

that distorts its meaning. Your Honor, please review my claim as I stated it in my complaint.

Next, Judge Hixson's comments on the SCA Sports screenings of in forma pauperis are outrightly discriminatory. He said that "[t]he in forma pauperis statute" is designed largely to discourage the filing of, and waste of judicial and private resources upon baseless lawsuits that paying litigants generally do not initiate because of the cost of bringing suit." He is claiming that poor people like myself are more likely to create baseless lawsuits than people who have money to file lawsuits. There is absolutely no foundation for this assertion.

The judge's explanation of why a lawsuit can be "frivolous" and consequently be subject to dismissal is truly unconstitutional. Regardless of a judge's excuses for dismissing a case, his dismissal allows him to deliver a wrongful verdict to the defendant without the consent of a jury. Dismissals allow ~~wrong~~ guilty parties to remain unaccountable without the prosecution having the chance (which is his right) to prove their guilt. Also, when a judge describes a claim as "frivolous",

and that he is not bound to accept the truth of the plaintiff's accusations, he is again passing judgment on the case without having the truth been debated and considered in court. This is clearly obstruction of justice on the part of the judge. It is completely disabling our judicial system.

Then, when the judge said that "to survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." What does "sufficient" mean here? If the plaintiff in a case claims that the defendant murdered someone, isn't "he murdered the victim" sufficient? And, how dare the judge argue that he has the authority to judge whether allegations are true or not! Again, he is deciding the verdict of the case without having it heard in court. Why should we have a court system in this country if judges are to be allowed to disrupt it and disable it to the point when it serves no purpose at all?

Judge Hiram goes on to say that my claims are frivolous. He questions my claim that the entire United States of America were affected by Mr. Trump's crime. "Of course the entire country is affected when the people's freedom of speech is denied, when the power of Congress is denied so that it is disabled, and when the survival of the people is threatened by global warming. Naturally, I did not explain in detailing my complaint how and why Mr. Trump committed his crime against America. I did not need to explain. That is what the Court is for."

As I mentioned earlier, the Judge claimed that my claim is frivolous because I want to restrict Mr. Trump from organizing other people to perpetrate destructive behaviors. Then he criticized my request that Mr. Trump be put on a 5150 psychiatric hold. Is it "frivolous" if I do not want to cause mental anguish in a man that I believe is suicidal? I am Jesus Christ. I know what is going on in the hearts and minds of human beings. Whether you believe me or not, is it wrong for me to try to lessen the potential anguish a mentally unstable person might experience were I to simply

accuse him before the entire world without showing mercy on him as well? My concern for Mr. Trump's well-being does not make my claim delusional or implausible. Then, Judge Hixen compared my claim to one where a defendant is accused of being a "Super-Spy". This is absurd.

Finally, Judge Hixen referred to the fact that the Supreme Court recognizes presidential immunity from damages and liability for acts within the "outer perimeter" of the president's official responsibility. He continued by stating his opinion that because my claim is based on the former president's actions as president, it is barred by absolute immunity. This is contradictory. The Supreme Court's explanation of the basis on which one can be prosecuted and the basis on which a president can be immune to prosecution is that a president would not be liable for acts within the outer perimeter of his official responsibility but simply

because his actions occurred while he was president. Also, if Judge Hixson is insinuating that the act of violating the Constitution and betraying the welfare of the American people falls within the "outer perimeter", he is wrong because changing a law does not qualify as being in the outer perimeter of his responsibility. It is only in the outer perimeter because it is unconstitutional. Changing a law is not part of the responsibility of the president.

There is one more point I want to mention. Even if Judge Hixson concedes that his dismissal was improper, yet he claims that it does not matter because it is the higher authority of the Supreme Court that motivated his decision, I am ready to face the Supreme Court in District Court and hold it accountable for obstructing justice and acting unconstitutionally. The Justices of the Court are ordinary people like you and me and are not immune to prosecution. I will demand that they restrict their legal doctrine to the guidelines of the Constitution. No one can stop me. If any judge does

try to stop me, I will go after him as well.
I am not being unreasonably litigious, I
simply have no other recourse than to go to
court to protect my truth.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Jesus Christ

Michelle Yvonne Wood

729 Jones St #308

S.F., CA 94109

(415) 335-0101

God bless and keep you.